



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,337	10/17/2003	Yan Borodovsky	10559/880001/P17482/Intel	2304
20985	7590	10/18/2007		
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,337

Applicant(s)

BORODOVSKY, YAN

Examiner

Daborah Chacko-Davis

Art Unit

1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-28 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-28 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7, 16-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 4,517,280 (Okamoto et al., hereinafter referred to as Okamoto) in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0091940 (Nakao).

Okamoto, in col 3, lines 12-54, discloses a method of patterning a substrate by forming a photoresist layer on the substrate, performing a first exposure by holographic exposure (interference lithography) to form an array of repeating line and space patterns (grating pattern, in a first photoresist layer), performing a second exposure via a mask (see figure 3(3)), thereby introducing irregularity (imparting the mask pattern or arbitrary arrangement) into the already formed repeating line and space patterns, i.e., reducing or ending the continuity of the array of the line and space pattern (grating pattern or trench pattern) (claims 1, 4, 16-17). Okamoto, in col 3, lines 25-55, and in figure 3, discloses forming an arbitrary figure (see reference B in figure 3(4), a second photoresist mask formed in a second photoresist layer) above or in some portion of the array of line and space patterns (grating), and etching (patterning) the substrate through portions not covered by the second photoresist mask B (arbitrary figure) using the arbitrary arrangement (directs the etching or selective etching) i.e., reducing the

Art Unit: 1795

continuity of the array of patterns by cutting spaces in the array and imparting or transferring the photomask or resist mask pattern onto the substrate (claims 2-3, 5, 7, 18-20).

The difference between the claims and Okamoto is that Okamoto does not disclose that the arbitrary figure comprises a first feature and a second feature that noncontiguous and that each bridge one or more of the repeating lines and spaces at different longitudinal positions. Okamoto does not disclose that the line and space patterns were formed via projection lithography patterning.

Nakao, in [0129], [0130], [0131], [0132], [0133], [0134], [0135], [0136], and in figures 35A, 35B, and 35C, discloses that the patterns transferred to the resist layer from the second photomask introduces irregularity such that features (first, second , third etc) that are noncontiguous and in longitudinal positions and bridging the initially formed line and space patterns are formed. Nakao, in [0058]-[0065], and figure 5, discloses that a stepper (projection lithographic patterning process) is used to form the line and space patterns.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Okamoto by employing the method of introducing irregularity into the line and space patterns in a manner suggested by Nakao because Okamoto, in col 5, lines 5-20, discloses that diffraction gratings of different periods and directions (lateral or longitudinal) in more than one region can be formed by repeating the process (coating photoresist, exposure, development etc) several times. It would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Okamoto by employing the stepper to form the line and space patterns as suggested by

Art Unit: 1795

Nakao because Nakao, in [0058], discloses that using a stepper such as a reduction projection exposure apparatus enables the formation of reduced patterns on the photoresist material.

3. Claims 8, and 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,517,280 (Okamoto et al., hereinafter referred to as Okamoto) in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0091940 (Nakao), as applied to claims 1-7, and 16-20, above, and further in view of EP 0915384 (Sugita et al., hereinafter referred to as Sugita).

Okamoto in view of Nakao is discussed in paragraph no. 2.

The difference between the claims and Okamoto in view of Nakao is that Okamoto in view of Nakao does not disclose the patterning of the substrate with the arbitrary arrangement uses a pitch yielding a k_1 factor smaller than 0.4 (claim 8). Okamoto in view of Nakao does not disclose that the first interference exposure process uses a pitch that yields a k_1 factor approaching 0.25 (claim 21).

Sugita, in col 4, lines 1-41, discloses using a k_1 factor of less than 0.4 and that a k_1 factor as low as 0.25 can be used in an interference exposure process.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Okamoto in view of Nakao by employing the pitch that generates the claimed k_1 factor as suggested by Sugita because Sugita, in col 3, lines 33-56, and in col 4, lines 1-15, discloses that the using the claimed k_1 factor i.e., less than 0.5 in an exposure process enables a higher

resolution in the pattern and produces a fine periodic pattern that corresponds to the intensity distribution of the impinged light on the wafer.

4. Claims 22-28, and 37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,517,280 (Okamoto et al., hereinafter referred to as Okamoto) in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0091940 (Nakao) and EP 0915384 (Sugita et al., hereinafter referred to as Sugita).

Okamoto, in col 3, lines 12-54, discloses a method of patterning a substrate by forming a photoresist layer on the substrate, performing a first exposure (first lithographic technique) by holographic exposure (interference lithography) to form an array of repeating line and space patterns (grating pattern, in a first photoresist layer) having a first pitch, performing a second exposure via a mask (see figure 3(3), a second lithographic technique), thereby introducing irregularity or imparting a second pattern with a second pitch into the already formed repeating line and space patterns, i.e., reducing or ending the continuity of the array of the line and space pattern (grating pattern, eliminating the impact of some of the line and space pattern portions on the substrate) and wherein the second pitch is more than twice that of the first pitch (see figure 3) (claims 22-24, and 26). Okamoto, in col 3, lines 34-40, and in figure 3 (3), discloses performing a second exposure on the line and space pattern using a binary mask (a mask with part of the mask providing a light shielding section and the remaining part of the mask is a transparent section) so as to eliminate the impact (continuity) of the array of patterns (claim 25). Okamoto, in col 3, lines 25-55, and in figure 3,

Art Unit: 1795

discloses forming an arbitrary figure (see reference B in figure 3(4), a second photoresist mask) above or in some portion of the array of line and space patterns (grating), and etching (patterning) the substrate through portions not covered by the second photoresist mask B (arbitrary figure) using the arbitrary arrangement (directs the etching or selective etching, transferring a superposition) i.e., ending the continuity of the array of the line and space patterns or eliminating the impact of some portions of the line and space patterns by etching the exposed areas (not covered by the arbitrary figure viz., mask)(claims 27-28, and 37).

The difference between the claims and Okamoto is that Okamoto does not disclose that a first feature, a second feature and a third feature is introduced in the photoresist layer in a noncontiguous manner and that each bridge one or more of the repeating lines and spaces at different longitudinal positions (first, second, and third longitudinal positions), and transferring the superpositions of each of the first, second and third features into the substrate. Okamoto is that Okamoto does not disclose that the first exposure process uses a pitch that yields a k_1 factor smaller than or equal to 0.5. Okamoto does not disclose that the first pitch yields a first k_1 factor approaching 0.25. Okamoto does not disclose that the second pitch yields a second k_1 factor greater than 0.5.

Nakao, in [0129], [0130], [0131], [0132], [0133], [0134], [0135], [0136], and in figures 35A, 35B, and 35C, discloses that the patterns transferred to the resist layer from the second photomask introduces irregularity such that features (first, second , third etc) that are noncontiguous and in corresponding first, second, and third

Art Unit: 1795

longitudinal positions and bridging the initially formed line and space patterns, and transferring the corresponding superpositioned patterns into the underlying substrate (see figures 35A through 35C, and figures 36-44).

The difference between the claims and Okamoto in view of Nakao is that Okamoto in view of Nakao does not disclose that the first exposure process uses a pitch that yields a k_1 factor smaller than or equal to 0.5. Okamoto in view of Nakao does not disclose that the first pitch yields a first k_1 factor approaching 0.25. Okamoto in view of Nakao does not disclose that the second pitch yields a second k_1 factor greater than 0.5.

Sugita, in col 4, lines 1-15, discloses using a k_1 factor of less than 0.5 in an interference exposure process. Okamoto, in col 4, lines 16-20, discloses that a lithographic process can be performed using a k_1 factor greater than 0.5.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Okamoto by employing the method of introducing irregularity into the line and space patterns in the manner suggested by Nakao because Okamoto, in col 5, lines 5-20, discloses that diffraction gratings of different periods and directions (lateral or longitudinal) in more than one region can be formed by repeating the process (coating photoresist, exposure, development etc) several times. It would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Okamoto in view of Nakao by employing the pitch that generates the claimed k_1 factor as suggested by Sugita because Sugita, in col 3, lines 33-56, and in col 4, lines 1-15, discloses that the using the claimed k_1 factor i.e., at least less than 1.0 in an exposure

Art Unit: 1795

process enables a higher resolution in the pattern and produces a fine periodic pattern that corresponds to the intensity distribution of the impinged light on the wafer.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed July 16, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-5,7, 16-20, under 35 U. S. C. 102 (b), and claims 8, 21-28, and 37, under 35 U. S. C. 103 (a) made in the previous office action (paper no. 20070512) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0091940 (Nakao).

A) Applicants argue that neither Okamoto nor Yamaguchi nor Sugita teaches noncontiguous first and second features that bridge one or more of the repeating lines and spaces of the array at different longitudinal positions.

Neither Okamoto, nor Yamaguchi, nor Sugita is relied upon to disclose this limitation. Nakao teaches the method of patterning the second photoresist layer formed on the array (line and space pattern) with a photomask such that first, second, third etc., features are formed in different longitudinal positions while bridging the line and space patterns.

B) Applicants argue that Okamoto has a single window that does not include non contiguous first and second features in the claimed manner.

See paragraph A). Although Okamoto is not relied upon for this limitation, Okamoto, teaches that the grating patterns (or patterns) can be formed in different

Art Unit: 1795

regions in different directions (longitudinal or lateral) with different periods. See paragraph nos. 2, and 4.

Conclusion

6. , Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daborah Chacko-Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 - 6:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark F Huff can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dcd



October 15, 2007.